DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 947 EC 123 216

AUTHOR	Churton, Michael W., Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings I: State of the Arts Conference on Adapted Physical Education in Mississippi (January 19 and 20, 1979).
INSTITUTION	University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
BUREAU NO	451AH80606
PUB DATE	Jan 79
GRANT	G007602947
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adapted Physical Education; Conference Reports; Educational Diagnosis; *Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicapped Children; Program Development; State Departments of Education; State of the Art Reviews; *State Programs; Teacher Certification; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Education for All Handicapped Children Act; Mississippi

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of a conference on the state of the art in adapted physical education in Mississippi are presented. After the conference agenda and a list of the speakers and session leaders, an overview of the conference is provided. The conference was designed to produce data and information that could be used to facilitate programing, research, and implementation in adapted physical education. Texts by the following Session 1 speakers are included: "State of the Arts--Adapted Physical Education--National Overview" by L. Johnson; "State Department of Education Personnel Preparation and Certification Requirements" by K. Davis; "State of the Arts--Adapted Physical Education--State Overview" by M. Churton; "Perspective--P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) and Adapted Physical Education--Practioner" by P. Buschner; and "Perspective--P.L. 94-142 and Adapted Physical Education--Student" by L. Fischer. Session 2 considers curriculum, personnel preparation and certification, and motor assessment in small group presentations. Recommendations follow each presentation and conclusions, such as the need for review of current and projected certification requirements, are reported. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EC

ED182947

PROCEEDINGS I

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE ON ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

Michael W. Churton, Editor

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Hattiesburg, Mississippi

A Monograph funded through the Research and Development Funds of the University of Southern Mississippi

Printed by the University of Southern Mississippi

EC123216

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael W Churton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
PREFACE	vi
CONFERENCE AGENDA	viii
GUEST SPEAKERS AND SESSION LEADERS	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
SESSION I:	
State of the Arts: Adapted Physical Education: National Overview - Dr. Leon Johnson	4
State Department of Education Personnel Preparation and Certification Requirements - Kermit R. Davis	14
Mississippi Cooperative System for Personnel Preparation - Michael W. Churton (not included)	
State of the Arts: Adapted Physical Education: State Overview - Michael W. Churton	17
Perspective: P.L. 94-142 and Adapted Physical Education: Administrator (Written format not available at publishing date.)	
Perspective: P.L. 94-142 and Adapted Physical Education: Practitioner - Patti Buschner	26
Perspective: P.L. 94-142 and Adapted Physical Education: Student - Lynn A. Fischer	32
SESSION II: SMALL GROUP PRESENTATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Curriculum Group Dialogue Topical Presentation - Gene Kidder Recommendations	35

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	Page
Personnel Preparation and Certification	41
Group Dialogue	
Topical Presentation - Dr. Joe Cracraft	
Dr. Mel Evans	
Recommendations	
Motor Assessment	44
Group Dialogue	
Topical Presentation - Dr. Walter E. Cooper	
Recommendations	
CONCLUSION	46

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Conference, which is the subject of Proceedings I, was supported in part by the University of Southern Mississippi Research and Development Funds and by Grant #G007602947, PR #451AH80606 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions contained within do not necessarily reflect the opinion or policy of the United States Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the United States Office of Education should be inferred.

There are several individuals to whom I would like to express my appreciation for making the Conference the success that it was. In particular, to Dr. Aubrey Lucas, President of the University of Southern Mississippi; Dr. William Brundage, Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs; Dr. Walter Cooper, Dean, School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and Dr. Bill Larson, Chairman, Department of Physical Education, University of Southern Mississippi.

I would also like to express my thanks to Ms. Lynn Fischer and Mrs. Barbara Larson who went beyond the call of duty to insure the success of the Conference. And, most of all, to all the participants who weathered a Mississippi Winter to attend the Conference.

Hattiesburg, Mississippi, 1979

PREFACE

Proceedings I contains the first systematic attempt in the State of Mississippi to present, in a documented format, the dialogues, issues, and projected needs that resulted from a statewide conference on Adapted Physical Education. The State of the Arts Conference on Adapted Physical Education held January 19 and 20, 1979, at the University of Southern Mississippi succeeded in bringing together a diversified group of professionals that included special education and physical education teachers, university faculty and administrators, State Department of Education representatives, and parents.

Proceedings I will help to document the need for Adapted Physical Education Specialists in the State. It is a premise of this document that adapted physical education specialists or physical education specialists with qualitative and comprehensive inservice training, are the only individuals qualified, as outlined in Section 121A12 of PL 94-142, to conduct appropriate physical education programs for the handicapped. The State of Mississippi is extremely far behind in its compliance with adapted physical education requirements as stipulated in PL 94-142. However, the task is not insurmountable if the professionals, practitioners, and State Department of Education officials begin to cooperate and delegate responsibility for establishing appropriate adapted physical education programs in the State.

Proceedings I has therefore established a basis for cooperation in that specific issues and needs have been cited. It does by no means

establish a unitarian direction, but rather emphasizes the need for further dialogues, research, and cooperation.

M.W.C.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

STATE OF THE ARTS
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION

JANUARY 19-20, 1979

AGENDA
(Revised)

FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1979 - MEETING ROOM B, STUDENT UNION

11:00- 1:00 .. REGISTRATION

1:00- 1:30 .. OPENING COMMENTS - Michael W. Churton

1:30- 2:15 .. STATE OF THE ARTS: ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION: NATIONAL LEVEL - Dr. Leon Johnson

2:15- 2:45 .. MISSISSIPPI STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION - Kermit Davis

2:45- 3:00 .. MISSISSIPPI COOPERATIVE SYSTEM FOR PERSONNEL PREPARATION - Dr. William Plue

3:00- 3:15 .. QUESTION & ANSWER PERIOD

3:15- 3:45 .. STATE OF THE ARTS: ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION: MISSISSIPPI - Michael W. Churton

3:45- 4:30 .. PL 94-142 AND ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION: ADMINISTRATOR'S VIEWPOINT - Gus Bowering

4:30- 5:00 .. PL 94-142 AND ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION: PRACTITIONER'S VIEWPOINT - Patti Buschner

5:00- .. CLOSING COMMENTS

5:00- 7:00 .. DINNER

7:00- 9:00 .. SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - Meeting Room B, Student Union

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1979 - MEETING ROOM B, STUDENT UNION

8:45-11:00 .. SMALL GROUP TOPICAL DISCUSSION

11:00-11:45 .. TOPICAL REPORTS

11:45-12:15 .. DISCUSSION - RECOMMENDATIONS

12:15-12:30 .. CLOSING

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

STATE OF THE ARTS
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION

JANUARY 19-20, 1979

GUEST SPEAKERS AND SESSION LEADERS

ALFRED ARRINGTON, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY, ITTA BENA, MS

GUS BOWERING, COORDINATOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, HATTIESBURG PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PATTI BUSCHNER, SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER, COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MICHAEL W. CHURTON, DIRECTOR, USM MOTOR DEVELOPMENT INSERVICE TRAINING PROJECT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

WALTER E. COOPER, DEAN, SCHOOL OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

JOSEPH CRACRAFT, ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION COORDINATOR, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

KERMIT DAVIS, CONSULTANT, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, JACKSON, MS

MEL EVANS, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY, JACKSON, MS

LEON JOHNSON, ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION COORDINATOR, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

GENE KIDDER, CURRICULUM COORDINATOR, MERIDIAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MERIDIAN, MS

BILL LARSON, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

JOHN PERRY, ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION COORDINATOR, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY, ITTA BENA, MS

WILLIAM PLUE, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

INTRODUCTION

A statewide conference entitled, "State of the Arts on Adapted Physical Education in Mississippi," was conducted on January 19 and 20, 1979, at the University of Southern Mississippi campus in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. The conference was supported in part by the University of Southern Mississippi, the United States Office of Education (BEH/DPP), and the Mississippi State Department of Education.

The purpose of the conference was to include as many of the State's practitioners, parents, and students as possible in productive and meaningful dialogues, so as to produce data and information that could be used to facilitate programming, research, and implementation in adapted physical education. The data compiled will, forwarded with recommendations to the Mississippi Cooperative System for Personnel Preparation, Ad Hoc Committee on Adapted Physical Education, and to the Mississippi Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation for the purpose of establishing a Section in MAHPER entitled, "Adapted Physical Education." The conference was conducted primarily to realize needs, issues, and to underscore the continuation of research and cooperation throughout the State.

To facilitate this end, a conference with two distinct sections was adopted. A national authority on adapted physical education was invited to present the State of the Arts in Adapted Physical Education on the national level in conjunction with a detailed presentation of the State of the Arts in Adapted Physical Education in Mississippi. Session

One also included perspectives from teachers, administrators, students, and the Mississippi State Department of Education on PL 94-142 and adapted physical education. Session Two focused upon small group interaction and discussions. Participants selected those topical areas that best suited their needs. Topical areas included personnel preparation, curriculum, certification requirements, assessment, and PL 94-142. However, groups were allowed to debate and discuss any issue they felt relevant to the scope of the conference.

The conference was successful in generating dialogues among the participants and in providing valuable information that was not presented through formal presentations in Session One. Results and recommendations are presented as transcribed from tape recorded summations of each group and also from notes recorded throughout the dialogues. Session One presentations were included as submitted by the presentor.

SESSION I

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION ON THE NATIONAL LEVEL

by
Dr. Leon Johnson

In 1973, Paul R. Diamond stated in the "Hastings Law Journal" that in education there was a quiet revolution going on in the educational world. Now, six years later in 1979, federal and state legislation has made this revolution a reality. No one likes to be told how to do their job, when to do it, or who the services should be provided for; however, after years of providing barely more than lip service and very little real action, the U.S. Congress has told the American public what it must do for this nation's handicapped individuals in terms of providing educational services.

For those of us involved in physical education, this may appear to be both the best of times and the worst of times; the best in terms of the federal legislation, the worst in terms of the various changes and crises that occur as physical educators struggle to make its part of Public Law 94-142 a practical reality.

It appears that things are going well in the sense that the present administration has very positive attitudes toward programming for, and education of the handicapped. Society is experiencing an era in which they can say that one of the major concerns is programming for the handicapped and for disadvantaged youngsters under the basic equal

education opportunity theme. For all who have worked very hard over the years, this public attitude represents considerable positive movement toward educating the "total" child.

There are few doubts that when new legislation is enacted that some amendments would be meritorious; there is no legislation passed by Congress that is not amended somewhere along the line and, in many instances, improved. But with PL 94-142, it is too early to do that now. The anxiety that many people feel when new legislation is passed might result in over-reaction that would, for example, delay the beginning date as to when educational services should be available to children or eliminate physical education from the definition of special education--because there are some educators that believe these things are creating a considerable amount of anxiety. Educators must be realistic enough and the Congress certainly must be realistic enough to understand that everything intended in the new law will not happen in ideal circumstances, with 100 percent effectiveness, all of the time. Nevertheless, it is terribly important that we have, as the basis of our educational operation, a professional commitment on the part of all state agencies, educators, and parents to do what is required under the law. In past years, we have been moving through a period of partial commitment or part official policy. In general, educators want to move past that posture. To do so, it is <u>extremely important</u> that we do not retreat now. In order to participate in the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, physical educators must say once and for all, "This is officially our policy; <u>we will meet this challenge</u>."

Yes, "a quiet revolution"[1] has been fought within American education during the past few years. Its goal is the right to an

education for all American children, and particularly those usually known as "the handicapped," those who, because of mental, physical, emotional, or learning problems, require special education services. It has been estimated that between 7 and 8 million children in the United States require special education services, one million of whom receive no educational services at all. Further, less than 50 percent of these children, all of whom will be in need of special education services at some time during their educational careers, are receiving the educational services they need.

This revolution--to establish for the handicapped the same right to an education that already exists for the nonhandicapped--has been occurring throughout the nation, in state and local school board rooms, state legislative chambers, and perhaps, the most important, in the nation's courts. While the most significant measure of the impact of this revolution is the number of children who will no longer be denied an appropriate education, it is very clear that other basic educational policy matters will be reshaped also.[2]

Since the enactment on November 19, 1975, PL 94-142 has received tremendous attention--both positive and negative--from all quarters of the educational community. Regardless, whatever one may feel about the law, it is very clear that its provisions will have a far-reaching effect on every handicapped child in the nation; on all state and local education agencies and other public agencies and institutions involved in the education of handicapped children; and on nearly 800 institutions of higher education that are engaged in training physical education personnel.

The U.S. Office of Education will be confronted with many situations that are less than perfect in the implementation of PL 94-142.

These situations are already being reported by institutions of higher learning, parent groups, and other advocate groups. There will be problems, things will not always work properly, and remedial actions will be necessary--some remedial actions will not be accomplished as soon or as well as they should. There has to be give-and-take on both sides. It is the job of the U.S. Office of Education to make sure that none of the problems, insofar as they can determine, is based on subterfuge or on an unwillingness of a government agency to do the job.

Basically, the U.S. Office of Education is operating on the basis of the following three points:

1. The Art will be implemented.
2. There will be a certain amount of muddling through, which is better than the alternative of having no firm dates or clearcut tasks.
3. To commit themselves as a professional group to working flexibly and cooperatively to solve the problems, but will not retreat from the principle that every youngster must be a part of an educational program.

One of the most frequently recurring issues will be the generalized attitude that these things cannot really be done effectively in physical education; and that all these handicapped children cannot be served; that children cannot be place in the least restrictive environments because physical educators are ill parpared to provide the appropriate service. Some of the greatest alarm has already been expressed by physical education teachers about the implementation of the intent of PL 94-142. Instead of expressing such alarms, physical education teachers must get involved at all levels to find ways to help meet the needs of teachers, rather than simply expressing cautions.

Institutions of higher education who are already in the business of training teachers in physical education will be under pressure to

stretch their capacities to all of the situations of local problems as they arise. Education's present manpower levels with attrition are costing about 15,000 professionals each year. The only way that such manpower needs can be met is to continue to have their replacements throughly trained in competent preservice education in physical education. The curriculum in physical education must be evaluated to assure that every physical educator is certified to teach all children the skills relative to physical education.

Across our country today, many physical educators are graduating from undergraduate physical education programs, taking teaching positions, and then discovering that they have to inservice with further knowledge and experiences to be an effective teacher of motoric skills to <u>all</u> children. These implications have to be reflective of the present curriculum in institutions of higher education in the preparation of physical education teachers today. Possibly, this suggests a dire need for inservice training for the faculties of the physical education units in higher education, so that they will become aware of educating <u>all</u> children as well as the total child.

The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution are the safeguards that protect children against certain types of educational evaluations and resulting classifications. In essence, these amendments provide that a person may not be denied liberty or property except by due process of law. At the present time, it is being argued in the courts that to deny an appropriate education is paramount to denying a person an opportunity to acquire property. Thus, if children are classified as handicapped, when in fact they are not, or if they are inaccurately classified, they are denied an opportunity to an appropriate education.[3]

It follows, it is argued, that a due process violation occurs when individuals are misclassified, because invalid criteria have been used to determine which educational program they should follow in school.

Like the courts, Congress has taken into account the fact that a school's failure to detect a child's handicaps or to assess him adequately can result in his being denied an appropriate education. Accordingly, it has also required that all procedures used for evaluation of children be selected and administered with the fact that race and culture have been considered. There is no single criterion that can be used for placement.[4]

Are the physical education teachers trained today to test the motoric skills of handicapped children, administer the evaluations so as not to discriminate on the due process of the child; are they prepared to participate in a multi-disciplinary approach of evaluation and program planning with other educational disciplines? These are the challenges that physical education teachers are being confronted with now.

Under PL 94-142, "Physical Education" is defined as follows:

(1) The term means the development of:

(a) Physical and motor fitness;
(b) Fundamental motor skills and patterns; and
(c) Skills in aquatics, dance, and individual and group games and sports (including intramurals and lifetime sports).
(d) The term includes special physical education, adapted physical education, movement education, and motor development.[5]

Within this definition, physical education will be responsible to improve, develop, and validate the necessary assessment instruments and train the qualified personnel to meet the contents of this definition and the intent of the law. This implication by itself will be a monumental task for all institutions of higher education; but if physical educators are to be competent to meet the total motoric needs of the handicapped children, this

task must have priority in personnel training programs.

As indicated earlier, this implication alone will have tremendous impact on teacher preparation in physical education. Traditional curriculum most likely will not meet the needs of physical educators entering into the manpower requirements of education today. Inservice training of present physical education faculties in institutions of higher learning is a must to meet these needs as the results of these critical issues and their implications.

The section of PL 94-142 that has received the most support and at the same time caused the most concern is the requirement that an individualized educational program (IEP) be developed and maintained for each handicapped child or youth. Support for the requirement focuses on the logic of instructional planning, and it follows that meeting the needs of students who present complex instructional problems requires detailed and systematic planning. The concern relates primarily to the lack of experience by school personnel in applying procedures suggested by the IEP requirement.

This lack of experience has resulted in much speculation about the training of personnel to develop IEP's, the time required for their preparation, and the development of procedures to evaluate and monitor the IEP's. To be effective, instructional planning must focus on the uniqueness of the individual learner. Thus, a planning process does not substitute for the teachers' lack of knowledge about how children learn. The following principles illustrate a range of teacher competencies which can be considered as prerequisites to effective planning for physical educators:

1. The learner should possess the basic readiness skills in motor development to ensure some degree of success in the new motor task.

2. The learner should be made aware of the value and meaning (to the best of the individual's ability) of the new motor task.

3. The motor task should be analyzed to determine the difficulties that may be encountered because of any special needs of the learner.

4. The motor task should begin with familiar experiences and motor skills and progress to new experiences and skills.

5. The motor task should include options that meet the learner's learning style.

6. The motor task should be so planned and presented in such a manner as to provide the learner with reinforced repetition and practice to ensure retention.

7. The motor task should provide for constant performance evaluation by the learner, teacher, paraprofessional, or peer tutor.

8. The assignment of a new motor task should be the result of continuous evaluation of the learner's performance on the present task.

Because the IEP process is governed by explicit guidelines, is expressed in written form, and includes evaluation procedures, some physical educators may perceive the IEP as a means for checking compliance with the law rather than as an instructional planning process to improve education for the handicapped. IEP contributions to accountability surely must be retained, but the focus should be on instructional benefits.

PL 94-142 is far more comprehensive than indicated by the discussion presented here. It incorporates provisions which define roles of the federal government, state educational agencies, and local educational agencies. It includes directives on identification procedures, fiscal responsibilities, and overall implementation processes. Personnel in physical education preparing for professional roles are encouraged to study the complete rules and regulations relevant to the law.

The accomplishments of the 1970's have made the study of exceptional children an essential element in professional preparation of all educators. No longer are the characteristics and needs of exceptional children a concern only to their parents and to special educators. School administrators, regular classroom teachers, and physical educators now share in the same responsibility for educating all children. For exceptional children and their families, the era of the 1970's represents an historical milestone. The ground rules for the 1980's clearly have been set.

Yes, "a quiet revolution" has been fought within American education--its goal: "The right to an education for all American children."

In conclusion, the "Right to Education" principle places physical educators in the middle of what must be judged to be a truly remarkable event, one with profound philosophical and practical implications. This is the declaration that every child, even the most profoundly handicapped, shall be given formal opportunities to learn within the public education system. "Right to Education" makes no reference to payoff for the society of various institutions; the enhancement of the life of the individual is the sole consideration and goal.

Of course, some physical educators and many others do not believe fully in the "Right to Education" principle. They will resist the difficult steps necessary to achieve full implementation of the principles in programs for the handicapped. Many educators still believe that education is a privilege and that individuals who fail to meet standards established by various criteria should be omitted.

The education of handicapped children takes considerable time and money and some educators may feel that such expenditures lessen resources

spent on other children. There is no evidence to support such a thesis; indeed, it can be argued that improvements in educational opportunities for the handicapped results in enhanced education for other children. In any case, physical educators must stretch themselves to the very edge of their powers at this strategic time to help achieve in fact an appropriate education for every child. This proposes special efforts to develop programs in physical education for every child.

---

[1]The phrase, "quiet revolution," comes from Paul R. Diamond, "The Constitutional Right to Education: The Quiet Revolution," The Hastings Law Journal, Vol. 24, 1973, pp. 1087-1127.

[2]Frederick J. Weintraub, and Alan Abeson, "New Educational Policies for the Handicapped: The Quiet Revolution," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 8, April 1974, pp. 526-569.

[3]H. Rutherford Turnbull III, "The Past and Future Impact of Court Decisions in Special Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 59, No. 8, April 1978, pp. 523.

[4]Larry P. V. Rules 343 F. Suppl. 1306, affd. 502 F. 2d 963 (9th Cir 1974) now in trial on merits.

[5]P.L. 94-142, and Reg. Sec. 121a.14 (a)(1)-(JJ).

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

MISSISSIPPI STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION

by
Kermit R. Davis, Consultant

The State Certification Requirements have been undergoing revisions for the last year and a half and is still open for responses from teachers, administrators and teacher training institutions.

The new Certification Requirements for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, as it pertains to Adaptive Physical Education, is a three hour course (Physical Education for the Exceptional Child). However, special education does not require a physical education course for their majors. It is listed as an elective course. If we are to make any additional changes, it must come from the teachers out in the field who take the time to write or call the Division of Certification, State Department of Education.

As your State Consultant in Physical Education, I have been working with Special Education teachers over the years with Physical Education activities they could use in teaching their students. We have many pamphlets on physical education that could be adapted to physical education for handicapped children, free from the Physical Education Section, Division of Instruction, State Department of Education. A list of these pamphlets is available.

The direction we must follow is to provide better physical education programs for handicapped children. This, through in-service workshops with special education teachers and workshops with physical education teachers to retrain them in new methods, such as writing IEP's for each handicapped child. This could be carried out through the cooperation of the Physical Education and Special Education Divisions in the State Department of Education and the cooperation of state teacher training institutions.

I think we must require at least two physical education courses of all special education teachers if we are to better improve physical education programs for handicapped children. Another direction would be for the Special Education Division of the State Department of Education to hire an Adaptive Physical Education person and place that person under the present State Consultant of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

FREE MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS:

1. Bulletin on Health Education for Mississippi High Schools
2. Bulletin on Guide for Teaching Physical Education, Grades 7-12
3. Pamphlet on Homemade Physical Education Equipment
4. Program Ideas for School or Community Recreation
5. Pamphlet on Motor Skill Tests for Grades 1-3
6. Pamphlet on Group Golf Instruction for Beginners
7. Pamphlet on Group Tennis Instruction for Beginners
8. Pamphlet on Youth Fitness Test, Age 10-17 (President's All American Team)
9. Pamphlet on Motor Skill Tests, Age 6-7-8
10. Student Physical Fitness Record Sheet for use with Youth Fitness and Motor Skill Tests.
11. Pamphlet on Group Bowling Instruction for Beginners.
12. Pamphlet on Gymnastic, Trampoline
13. State Superintendent of Education Fitness Certificates
14. Activities Using Innovative Equipment in Elementary Physical Education
15. Information on A.A.H.P.E.R. and M.A.H.P.E.R.
16. Information on President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports
17. Brochures on Physical Fitness
18. Pamphlets on smoking and health
19. Pamphlets on Games Using Improvised Equipment, K-8
20. Pamphlets on Suggested Singing Games, Folk Dances, and Rhythm Activities, K-8
21. Checklist Characteristics of Students Who Need Perceptual-Motor Training
22. A 16-Week Sequential and Developmental Perceptual-Motor P.E. Lesson Plan

FILMS: Physical Education films and health film catalogs are available through the Health Film Library, Mississippi State Board of Health, P. O. Box 1700, Jackson, MS 39205.

1. VIM, exercise film for girls, age 12 to 18
2. VIGOR, exercise film for boys, age 12 to 18
3. Elementary Physical Education, Teachers and Administrators

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

by
Michael W. Churton

The USM Motor Development Inservice Training Project was funded in June 1976, for a three year period. A need was identified at that time to conduct inservice training for the purpose of providing appropriate motor development programs for exceptional children. It was also determined at that time that the most professionally and economically feasible group of teachers to inservice train were special education teachers. At that period of time, there were no elementary physical education teachers and few secondary physical education teachers. The reason for this discrepancy focused on the lack of a state elementary physical education requirement and the emphasis placed on coaching in the secondary area as opposed to teaching. The remaining population was the special education teachers themselves. Based on a lack of appropriate adapted physical education programs in the State, the USM Motor Development Inservice Training Project was initiated.

The conference was a direct spin-off of two key events that occurred within the last two years. First of all, in 1977 the Mississippi Cooperative Manpower Committee established an Ad Hoc Committee on Adapted Physical Education. This enactment provided a vehicle (however conservative) by which input could be delivered directly to policy making organizations. Although it took two days to pass the Ad Hoc Committee motion,

it was, nevertheless, an important milestone in the State of Mississippi.

The second event that helped to facilitate the birth of the conference was the results of a need assessment that the USM Department of Physical Education conducted during the Fall of 1978. The questionnaire was intended to determine the background, needs, and experiences of personnel who worked with exceptional children in the field. Over 525 questionnaires were mailed, with less than 100 individual responses. This is an extremely low ratio and conclusions drawn from the data would be erroneous in generalizing to the overall population. However, the results do indicate a discrepancy or a state of contradiction that exists in the field. As indicated by the various postmarks, the responses represented a wide distribution across the State. Some of the results of the questionnaire are shown in Table One. The results of this research were presented at the Mississippi Alliance on Health, Physical Education, and Recreation's Annual Conference held in Biloxi, Mississippi, on October 28, 1978.

A further basis was established through direct one-to-one contact with practitioners in rural and non-rural areas. I have visited teachers in schools and at home from Wilkinson to Greene County; and from Scott to Hancock County. I have been to schools that do not even have a softball for equipment nor a field on which to exercise. I have been to schools here in Mississippi that will not allow the handicapped near or into the gymnasium for fear that they will "mess the place up." I have visited schools where the principal and the superintendent participated in activities with the children on a semi-regular basis. I have talked with teachers who have not heard of the I.E.P. and to some who have been told by administrators not to worry about I.E.Ps. All in all, I have seen and

TABLE ONE

	AGREEMENT				
	FULL		PARTIAL		LITTLE
	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of Handicapping Conditions	17%	4%	24%	23%	29%
Amount of Preservice or Inservice Training	17%	4%	23%	23%	29%
Competencies in Motor Assessment	2%	15%	26%	26%	40%
Competencies in the Area of Program Design	26%	14%	25%	14%	17%
Need for Volunteers	51%	19%	19%	2%	12%
Resources are Needed	24%	21%	17%	17%	20%
Specialists in Adapted P.E. are Needed	46%	24%	11%	9%	5%
Handicapped Children have Equal Access to Equipment anf Facilities	21%	10%	8%	6%	35%
Awareness of New Issues					
P.L. 94-142	23%	7%	12%	21%	31%
Mainstreaming	34%	19%	23%	4%	19%
Perceptual-Motor Importance	51%	38%	10%	0	0
Assessment	Agree it's important. . 89% Do not feel it's important 10%				

89% of the teachers surveyed teach handicapped children.

76% of these teachers have never had a course in Adapted Physical Education or a Special Education course.

45% of the teachers who did have a course in Adapted Physical Education or Special Education have only had one basic course in Adapted P.E.

18% of the teachers who have had a course dealing with handicapped children have had a special education course.

60% of the teachers surveyed teach a mainstreamed class, yet only 53% of these teachers understand the concept of mainstreaming fully.

4 teachers, although certain they do not teach the handicapped, indicated that they teach in a mainstreaming situation.

learned a great deal in two and one-half years in Mississippi.

I do not wish to mislead anyone on my position towards adapted physical education in the State. The State of the Arts in Adapted Physical Education in Mississippi is not good. You have heard Dr. Leon Johnson comment on the status of adapted physical education on a national basis; it is now necessary to discuss adapted physical education on a local or state level. The purpose of the conference is not to convince but rather to promote discussion on key issues.

Dickie Conn, a physical education teacher from McComb and a graduate of L.S.U., could not be in attendance today, but his experiences this past summer, I feel, epitomizes the purpose of this conference. Dickie and his wife, Joy, also a physical education teacher in the South Pike School District, attended a five day workshop in North Carolina concerned with adapted physical education. The workshop was funded through the Regional Developmental Disability Training Institute. The workshop included representatives from the eight state Southeast Region that includes North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Florida, and Mississippi. Dickie's summation of the workshop is as follows:

> ". . . I was laughed at; they could not believe that I taught at five different schools and saw the kids only once a week for thirty minutes. Most of the people that attended the conference were either Adapted Physical Education Specialists or Physical Education Teachers with retraining in Adapted Physical Education. Mississippi, in terms of programs and personnel, was at the bottom of the totem pole."

We need, therefore, to look at <u>why</u> Mississippi is at the bottom of the totem pole!

The State of the Arts in Physical Education or Motor Development for the handicapped in the State of Mississippi is confounded by a

variety of interacting variables. These variables include the economic status of the State, personnel priorities, curriculum, certification requirements, service needs, administrative misconceptions and misunderstandings. The interaction of these variables have had a detrimental effect upon the growth and development of handicapped and non-handicapped children, especially in the area of physical education.

The State of Mississippi has established, as a priority area, the development of qualified and competent personnel to serve the needs of the identified handicapped population in the State, the unserved handicapped children in the State, and the severely and profoundly handicapped. Personnel who are trained to teach physical education to the handicapped are professionally termed, "Adapted Physical Education Specialists." Adapted physical education specialists are qualified to teach handicapped children, focusing upon motor assessment, prescriptive programming, curriculum development, and remedial and corrective programs. The adapted physical education specialist is the individual who should be evidenced by professional preparation and certification boards to administer appropriate physical education programs to the handicapped in Mississippi.

ISSUE ONE: WHY ISN'T THERE ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION?

PL 94-142 has outlined and emphasized the need for qualified and competent teachers concerned with physical education for the handicapped.[1] However, the State of Mississippi has not demanded this individual from the institutions of higher education. Although the University of Southern Mississippi is the only four year institution of higher education that offers a competency based emphasis area leading to a Masters Degree in Physical Education, there have been very few students selecting the adapted physical education emphasis area. The reason is quite simple--

there have been virtually no requests from the job market, namely the public schools.

If there are no adapted physical education specialists in the schools, then who is conducting the physical education programming in the State. Your first inclination might be to suggest the elementary physical education specialists. This could be a valid selection. This is not to say that I am substituting an elementary physical educator for an adapted physical education specialist, but rather that an elementary physical education specialist with either inservice or retraining could prove to be a viable alternative--I know of other states that are using this approach to comply with the law.

In a recent letter from the State Department of Education, I was informed that the majority of the handicapped student population in the State is currently receiving an appropriate physical education program through mainstreaming. The Mississippi Cooperative System for Personnel Preparation in its Status Report #4, projected a handicapped population by 1981 to exceed 116,000 children.[2] If 50% of these children are elementary aged, then approximately 55,000 children will be receiving an appropriate physical education program through mainstreaming--the mainstreaming class being taught by the elementary physical education specialist. This seems to be a very logical and practical means of accomplishing minimal compliance. However, there is one factor I have not mentioned. How can an appropriate physical education program be afforded to the handicapped through a mainstreaming situation taught by an elementary physical education specialist when the State of Mississippi does not require elementary specialists to conduct elementary physical education programs.[3] The State has taken the position to say that

quality physical education programs can be administered by the classroom teacher. Somebody, therefore, should inform the State Department of Education prior to 1981 that 55,000 handicapped children will not be receiving an appropriate physical education program. You see, PL 94-142 mandates that the person teaching the handicapped be qualified. The classroom teacher is not qualified!

This leads directly into the other 55,000 junior high and secondary aged handicapped students. The State of Mississippi requires physical education in the junior and senior high schools; however, it has been a policy in Mississippi, as well as in other states, that physical education majors are hired for their coaching expertise first, and teaching credentials second. Needless to say, there are many excellent teachers in the field, as well as coaches, but we are talking about qualified individuals to administer appropriate physical education programs to the handicapped. State Certification Requirements, as mentioned by Mr. Davis (MS State Department of Education), has not in the past required any coursework in adapted or special education for physical educators. The State Department claims that these graduates are qualified to teach the handicapped and justified that claim by stating that 55,000 handicapped will be afforded an appropriate physical education program through a mainstream setting by 1981. Handicapped children who function within the normal motor range should have little problem in physical adjustment; but what about social adaptation? Is the coach qualified to handle adaptation problems? What about the physically handicapped, the perceptually handicapped, the clumsy child? Is the coach qualified to teach these children? I contend that having no certification requirements in the area of adapted physical education does not justify the

State Department in granting a blanket policy of allowing every physical education major the competencies to teach the handicapped.

I have done quite a bit of traveling in my short period of life. I have lived with a variety of different cultures stemming from Malay, Indian, Chinese, Taiwanese, Philippino, and Singaporians. One factor I have found among these various cultures is that they do the very best they can with what they have. That is, there is little waste allowed. However, this has not been the case in Mississippi. We are wasteful in this State. The point being, we have the professional staff to train adapted physical educators. We have a federal mandate that says we are supposed to have adapted physical educators, and we have the money to offer to students to become adapted physical educators, but we don't have adapted physical educators! And that is the whole crux of this conference. Why haven't we produced adapted physical educators, and also what can we, as teachers and students, do to help implement quality adapted physical education programs in the schools.

CONCLUSION

The problem, as it has become evident to me, focuses upon four immediate issues that need to be qualified. These issues are, in themselves, needs of the State in the area of adapted physical education. These issues include:

Personnel Preparation - Who is responsible for preparing adapted physical educators?

Certification Requirements - What will the student need in terms of competencies to teach physical education to the exceptional child?

Curriculum and Methods - How and what will we teach to the handicapped student population?

Assessment - How do we determine where the functioning level is so that programming may begin?

These are but four issues that lie at the crux of the problem. Hopefully, through small group interaction and discussion, we will gain a bit more insight to the "How's" "What's" and "Who's" that are desperately needed in this State. It becomes so very important that we open communication channels which, in turn, allows us the variety to present opinions however controversial or personal. The State of the Arts in Adapted Physical Education in Mississippi, although not good, is far from being lost. Hopefully, this conference will begin the task of finding a common and unified direction.

---

[1]DHEW, OE. "Federal Register: Education of Handicapped Children." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

[2]Mississippi State Department of Education. "Standards for Accreditation of Elementary and Secondary Schools." Mississippi State Department of Education Printing Office, Jackson, Mississippi, 4th Ed., 1976.

[3]MMCEC. "Status Report #4." Mississippi State Department of Education, September 1978.

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

A SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER'S PERSPECTIVE ON PL 94-142 AND ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION

by
Patti Buschner

In November 1975, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act became Public Law 94-142, appropriating $100 million for the handicapped, to expand to 3.1 billion dollars by the year 1982.

Public Law 94-142 has mandated that, among other things, handicapped children shall receive appropriate physical education instruction. It is obvious from your attendance at this Conference that you all have an interest in providing appropriate physical education instruction to handicapped children. Though the research on the actual benefits to the handicapped child, especially in the academic area, is conflicting, successes in physical activities have been shown to improve physical development, fitness levels, self-concept and interpersonal relationships, among other areas. It should be remembered that children interact with their environment in three domains: the cognitive; the affective; and the psychomotor. Therefore, opportunities to grow and develop should be provided in all domains, to help insure a more well rounded individual. This quote from an article in the Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation by Timothy Nugent, concerning physical education for the handicapped child, put it best for me.

> "If there is justification for physical education and recreation in the life of anyone, then it is even more justified in the life of the individual who has lost a portion of his physical well-being and who, because of apathy, attitudinal barriers, and physical barriers, has been prone to inactivity or has had inactivity unjustly imposed upon him. The physical implications and advantages of physical activity are readily recognized; the social and psychological benefits are not so readily identified nor as easily evaluated, but they occur also."

A survey by the AAHPER (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation) in 1973 showed that 27 states provided physical activities to children with various handicapping conditions, but only 12 states required physical educators working with handicapped children to have special preparation. The survey said nothing about requirements for special preparation for special education teachers teaching physical education.

Though the number of states providing for adapted or mainstreaming physical education programs and supporting additional emphasis on special preparation has increased since 1973, Mississippi has not been one of the states to mandate such change. Not only does our state not provide for special physical education, but it does not even provide for physical education specialists for the elementary child. Physical education is provided for in the junior high and high school level, which is fine if the child at this level is capable of participating in a regular program. But since the secondary physical educator is not trained for handicapped physical education, these children are either inappropriately served, or not served at all.

This leaves the special educator, who may or may not have training in physical education to fulfill the motor needs of the handicapped children. This leads to several problems as special educators

who are not knowledgeable in the area of physical education may not appreciate the importance of providing such motor training and place it very low on the instructional priority list; or select activities for activities' sake that may or may not be appropriate to the child's problem; or improperly sequence activities so as not to provide a systematic plan of remediation or training.

As with any other educational discipline, in order for a teacher to be a successful change agent in physical education he or she must be skilled in the motor patterns that are being presented. By skilled, I don't mean highly competent, but at least to have a basic understanding of the fundamental motor patterns involved and the ability to execute the movement properly. An ability to analyze movement or to recognize faulty movement patterns and to pinpoint areas of weakness is important.

In order to provide an individual program the teacher must also be able to assess, diagnose and write an appropriate plan for remediation or skill development. To accomplish this, knowledge of body development, movement patterns, methods, materials, and curriculum development is essential.

Of course, the bottom line in achieving what I have first mentioned is the teacher. Is the teacher interested in providing a quality physical education program and acquiring the necessary knowledge base or is her interest solely in the academic program. Not all teachers are interested in getting down and rolling around on the floor, or skipping and playing ball with their students. Some teachers may feel that their expertise is in the areas of reading or math and that these areas are more important for the child to learn, as they are the tools that he will need to survive in the world after he leaves school.

This brings us to another consideration--many teachers teach in a resource-room setting where the child is seen for a limited amount of time, sometimes not even every day. When a child is seen for 45 minutes a day, the teacher may feel herself torn between taking time for physical education at the expense of academic instruction. With self-contained classes, there might not seem to be as much of a problem, but the day becomes very short when you are required to provide for all the needs of the child and somehow physical education becomes very low on the priority list for the teacher who has little interest or inadequate training in physical education.

Another problem faced by the teacher is the lack of equipment. From talking with other special education teachers in the state, I have found that equipment in different districts varies from well equipped to no equipment at all. Though many physical activities require little or no equipment, proper equipment is important and helpful. If the special teacher is providing for physical education, then requests for equipment must be made possible at the expense of academic materials; and as most of us are on very limited budgets, this does present problems. There is much equipment that can be homemade by those so interested and motivated. There are also funds provided by PL 94-142 for special equipment for physical education. However, directing of state and local funds for physical education equipment and supplies is not going to happen automatically. Supervisors, principals, and teachers must get in and scrape for funds.

One final consideration for the teacher is the severity of the physical involvement of the children served. Of course the learning disability student with a mild perceptual problem is going to be easier

to program for than the severely involved trainable child who is confined to a wheelchair and has a heart condition. This may seem to be an extreme example, but as teachers, you know that within your class, there is a wide variety of abilities, disabilities, strengths, weaknesses, interests, and motivation. What is good for one is not necessarily good for all, and a wide knowledge base is necessary to provide adequately for all.

I attended the Motor Development Inservice Training Project at the University of Southern Mississippi for the first two years it was offered, from 1976-78. The purpose of the project is to train special education teachers in programs which develop the motoric needs of their handicapped students. It is through this project that I developed an interest in teaching in the psychomotor domain and attempting to provide some of the motor development needs of my students. Through the project workshops I received an introduction into the areas of:

Motor Fitness and Proficiency
Perceptual-Motor Training
Fundamental Movement Patterns
Game and Dance Activities
Assessment Instruments
Prescription Writing and Program Implementation

Before participation in the project, I had taken only one physical education class as an undergraduate. This class was Teaching Physical Education in the Elementary School. This I later found to be more than some other teachers also participating. Though the information and materials presented through the project workshops were excellent, it was no substitute for a quality professional preparation program or a trained physical education specialist. Such a project, however, is necessary in our State to serve as a stop-gap measure. But as special

educators, physical educators, administrators, and concerned individuals, we should ask ourselves if we are willing to accept well-intentioned but inadequately trained special education teachers teaching physical education to the handicapped. There are options:

We can act as agents to motivate the legislature to provide funds for qualified physical education specialists in the schools and physical education specialists with special training working with the handicapped.

We can also work to press colleges and universities to provide comprehensive undergraduate preparation programs, continuing intensive graduate classes and quality long term inservice training through both the special education and physical education departments.

Physical education is an area through which much can be done for the handicapped. What we need to ask ourselves at this point is:

"Is <u>any</u> physical education better than no physical education?"

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

A STUDENTS PERSPECTIVE ON PERSONNEL PREPARATION

by
Lynn Fischer

To begin with, I feel that Adapted Physical Education is a coming profession. In order for it to remain a profession, there must be standards and criteria in the preparation of Adapted Physical Educators.

I am a supporter of the generalized physical education degree at the undergraduate level. I feel that a good base of support with a little bit of experience in all areas will better qualify a person for any area of specilization. Independents and practical experiences should be an integral part of this undergraduate preparation.

The graduate level should be where the specialization should occur. If the undergraduate background allowed for practical experience and for independents in the field, the graduate student should be ready for some "on hands" experience. The duplication on the graduate level, as it stands now is pitiful. Why is it necessary for coaches, elementary specialists and adapted people to all be in the same course? How can principles of teaching be made to apply for all these fields? How can stories of football training, the refinement of skill and athletic injuries apply to the teaching of severely handicapped children? I, for one, am not able to carry over information to that degree. We speak so strongly now that I.E.P.'s must be made for the handicapped children in

the schools--I say that I.E.P.'s should be made for graduate students as well. The use of independents and practical experience, should help alleviate some of the cost problems.

Where in the education of the adapted physical educator are we being trained to be an integral part of the multidisciplinary team that we so strongly support in special education? If physical education and motor development is to become a vital part of the child's education, we then must prepare adapted physical educators to be a professional and to have a background in areas that are necessary for him to carry out this role---behavior modification, I.E.P. writing, planning sessions, assessment and remediation of the various problems, exposure to all the handicapping conditions and knowing how to act at a due process hearing to gain the impetus that is needed. Where are we learning to help support the regular physical educator in their efforts to mainstream. If we do our job right, shouldn't all these children eventually be mainstreamed? If this is to occur, the non-specialist will need much support and on hands help--that's our job and we need to be prepared for it.

Get the graduates out in the field and get them prepared for their specialization. Don't force repetition and irrelevant courses down their throats to meet core requirements. Let the undergraduate program do that.

SESSION II

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

SESSION II

TOPICAL AREA: CURRICULUM

Group Resume

The discussion group concerned with curriculum was interspersed with a multi-background of educators. Participants represented curricula areas that included educable mentally retarded, trainable mentally retarded, learning disabled, and the preschool handicapped. Below is the secretary's and tape recorded summation of the discussion that occurred.

Group Dialogue

1.0 It was agreed that each individual child's rate of development; intellectual, cognitive, and psychomotor skills; environmental and adaptive behavior factors will greatly influence the development of a motor curriculum.

1.1 Recommendation: Prior to the development of a curricula, one must realize the current functioning level of a child and how to assist the child in developing from current status to some stated objective. This connotes proper and effective motor, cognitive, and affective assessments. Also, competent personnel are needed to assess, evaluate, and plan for effective motor programs.

2.0 Learning styles differ greatly, such as in:

2.1 individual's ability to initiate and sustain the learning process.

2.2 amount of time and experiences needed in the pace of learning.

2.3 amount of encouragement, repetition, and prodding needed to attack a learning task.

2.4 amount, frequency and kind of motivation needed.

2.5 differences in reaction time, building concepts, moving from concrete to abstract.

2.6 varying functional levels involved in the educational process.

2.7 the varied physical needs.

3.0 Important to realize that children are alike in many ways.

3.1 They want stability in a world of chaos.

3.2 They want activities where they can experience immediate success.

3.3 They want teachers that like them, help them to learn, let them be, and help them to become.

3.4 They want attention and to be accepted.

3.5 They want to share.

3.6 They want love.

3.7 They want to relate to each other.

4.0 Success in working with special education, handicapped students in curriculum offerings is difficult and is dependent upon an understanding of their special individual problems. An understanding and acceptance of the ways handicapped students adjust to the problems presented by their handicapped condition is also of utmost importance:

4.1 Sublimation - replacement of a desire that cannot be satisfied.

4.2 Compensation - to offset a limitation by developing a special ability.

4.3 Repression - unconscious inhibition of unpleasant memories.

4.4 Escape - avoid reality by day dreaming.

4.5 Projection - place blame on others for shortcomings.

4.6 Identification - mimics of admired person.

4.7 Rationalization - substitution of reason other than the real one for certain acts.

4.8 Frustration - unable to experience success.

4.9 Failure - unable to succeed in an experience.

4.10 Regression - taking backward steps.

5.0 The following specific considerations have been demonstrated as workable and effective in teaching the handicapped student and in guiding teachers in their quest for meaningful, effective and efficient programs:

5.1 A good environment should be provided for the wholesome personality development of children.

5.2 Goals of education, which are for the most part similar to those for normal children, must be established.

5.3 Special education students need much help in developing skills and abilities to offset their problems.

5.4 Satisfactory substitutes must be found for the desires they cannot attain.

5.5 Special teaching methods, equipment and physical facilities are necessary in order to meet the personal, social and intellectual needs of these children.

5.6 Education of the whole child is important and must include all domains--affective, cognitive, and psychomotor. They are all interrelated.

6.0 All of this holds many implications for us as teachers of mentally retarded and handicapped. We must:

6.1 Recognize the uniqueness of each child and grant to each the right to be himself, be different from others, accept him as he is, and allow him to become whatever he can become.

6.2 Motivate the mentally retarded child by helping him to set up desirable objectives and by arousing an enthusiasm for working to achieve them.

6.3 Present the child with alternatives and yet, tell the child what to do when it is involved in learning.

6.4 Reduce the environment stimuli by removing distractions from the environment and using a minimum of space in which the child works in the beginning and gradually moves to providing stimulating equipment and enlarging the play area.

6.5 Work with the individual child in the beginning and gradually move to working with twosomes, small groups, and finally large groups.

6.6 Start with teacher control in learning situations with gradual emancipation of the child from this control to positive controls evolved by the child.

6.7 Recognize and focus on strengths and assets by giving immediate reinforcement for an accomplished task.

6.8 Use color, humor, love, art, brains, routine, and movement.

6.9 Be firm, warm, prepared, helpful, consistent, angelic, undaunted, and enthusiastic (its caught--not taught).

6.10 Use simple verbal directions and use them sparingly.

6.11 Make practice periods short with frequent change of activities inorder to avoid frustrations over regression in the performance of the skill.

6.12 Use visual aids as supplementary tools and motivators.

6.13 Use repetition, drill and review of skills more often than with the non-retarded.

6.14 Use activities as a challenge and capitalize on the abilities and interests of the children.

6.15 Pace instruction deliberately and progressively.

6.16 Keep the fun in fundamentals.

6.17 Provide ways for the child to experience success.

6.18 Touch the children and show them that you love each one.

6.19 Participate in some of the activities with the children.

6.20 Help the child to learn when necessary, but let him also learn by exploring.

6.21 Make sure the child knows what you expect of him.

6.22 Use positive behavior modification techniques.

7.0 Expose the child to a variety of movement activities including tasks to enhance basic movement (including gross and fine motor), perceptual motor, and physical fitness skills. These activities should be presented in a sequential order dictated by their difficulty along the needs and capabilities of the child. The following specific hints for teaching movement may assist teachers in building a sequenced program of activities to develop individual motor development programs.

7.1 Use a pattern of orderly development moving from bilateral movements to unilateral movements, and from large muscle to fine motor movements.

7.2 Sequence skill developmental tasks from simple to compound, to complex, and make sure each task is mastered before moving to the next. They should also be psychologically paced to permit success.

7.3 Care should be taken to provide ample opportunities for short rest periods during vigorous activities.

7.4 Include plenty of positive reinforcement in order to encourage the establishment of a positive self concept and reduce fear of failure.

7.5 Provide for individual difference and allow for each child to progress at their own rate.

7.6 Use manual guidance when necessary to assist the child in developing a kinesthetic awareness of the desired movement.

7.7 Assist children in helping them to establish reasonable expectations of their abilities.

7.8 Reinforce specific skill in games and rhythms that involve the same skill.

7.9 If necessary start movement activities with one individual child, move to working with twosomes, then threesomes and finally with small groups.

7.10 Use "teachable moments."

7.11 In the conceptual problem solving approach, demonstrate only when absolutely necessary in order to get the child to respond but when possible try to let the child do it his way and make individual challenges to improve technique.

Group Recommendations

1.0 More help and cooperation needed from the State Department of Education.

2.0 A need for a sequential program to be developed for the EMR's throughout the State.

3.0 Workshops in handling emotionally disturbed individuals' behavior problems and motor problems.

4.0 Consultants needed to help assess and evaluate current programs and curricula.

5.0 Resources and information that yield materials that offer a variety of purposes.

6.0 Funds to purchase more materials.

7.0 Revision of State Department's regulations and guidelines.

8.0 Help in providing parents with training in the programs that occur in school.

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

SESSION II

TOPICAL AREA: PERSONNEL PREPARATION

Group Resume

The topical areas of personnel preparation and certification were combined as agreed upon by a general consensus of the participants. This group encompassed the greatest number of participants with backgrounds in physical education, either as students or teachers. Besides physical educators, the group was comprised primarily of university and/or State Department of Education personnel. A minimal number of special education teachers were present.

Group Dialogue (Paraphrased)

1.0 Development of grants to augment adapted physical education specialists in each school district.

2.0 Confusion over "least restrictive environment" and mainstreaming. Straight line definition of "least restrictive environment" is needed.

3.0 Composite or joint degree offering in special education and adapted physical education. Most special education departments do not wish to incorporate physical education with special education because it creates competition.

4.0 Mississippi should require physical education programs throughout the elementary and secondary schools, conducted by specialists.

5.0 Need a specialized, instead of generalized, approach to physical education.

6.0 Need to begin with physical education people already in the field; not necessarily the coaches.

7.0 Five steps before certification:

7.1 Develop expertise in the field of adapted physical education.

7.2 Field test it through the principals.

7.3 Recognized as a needed service.

7.4 Rewrite, review, and reconsider basis of adapted physical education.

7.5 Seek certification.

8.0 Survey conducted by the University of Southern Mississippi indicated that inservice in adapted physical education is necessary. Results of this survey were supported by a survey conducted by Jackson State University in which 7 out of approximately 98 people didn't want inservice training.

9.0 Each state university serves its own area in terms of personnel preparation.

10.0 Commitments from administrators and superintendents prior to the initiation of any service.

11.0 Public relations is a necessity for the success of any program. Ideas to focus on television, ETV, newspaper, radio projects were discussed.

12.0 Establishment of demonstration schools with tentative requirements such as:

12.1 Daily 30 minute physical education program for boys and girls.

12.2 Health test boys and girls.

12.3 Fifteen minutes of program should be required activities to build fitness.

12.4 Visitation periods.

12.5 Annual report.

13.0 Need to work out an adaptive physical education undergraduate curriculum.

14.0 Certification revision won't be completed until end of this year. Suggest supplying more information to State Department of Education.

15.0 Need always to seek to show credibility of adapted physical education.

16.0 Organization and common directions are vitally needed.

17.0 Conference for parents to get their support. Invite administrators.

18.0 Attend an administrator's meeting to state views.

Group Recommendations

1.0 In terms of certification, particularly at the undergraduate level, the state of affairs in Mississippi does not appear feasible to push for separate certification in adapted physical education.

2.0 We need to build the other factors, such as compliance to PL 94-142 which will preface this certification.

3.0 In lieu of certification at this time, to insure that the adapted and therapeutic recreation majors are employed, a composite degree should be sought. Alternatives:

3.1 Physical Education and Special Education with adapted emphasis.

3.2 Physical Education and Corrective Therapy with adapted emphasis.

4.0 There is a need for demonstration programs or demonstration schools to show the need and set up criteria. This could be used as advertisement for what could be done. This should enhance the employment of special physical educators in schools.

5.0 There should be a major thrust in inservice training to those physical education teachers already out in the field. The major emphasis should be for getting a commitment from administrators.

6.0 Teacher preparation should include a lot more practicum, more practical experience, or hands on experience. The problem now is that there is too much theory and not enough application. Need to get a better balance.

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

SESSION II

TOPICAL AREA: MOTOR ASSESSMENT

Group Resume

The discussion group concerned with motor assessment included physical education teachers, special education teachers, university faculty, administrators, and institution representatives. Professional interests included evaluation and assessment, deaf/blind, preschool, mental retardation, motor assessment, and orthopedically impaired. Below is the recorded minutes and the transcript of the audio cassette recording.

Group Dialogue (Paraphrased)

1.0 It is imperative that all personnel who work with or teach the handicapped should be aware of PL 94-142 and the implications it has for motor development and physical education.

2.0 Motor development specialists should be on the local and regional screening teams.

3.0 What level should the teacher become involved in the process of motor assessment? Or should she/he become involved at all?

4.0 Identification of valid methods of assessment is needed.

5.0 State Department of Education should become more aware of motor assessment needs in the State.

6.0 There are three basic areas of motor assessment that includes motor fitness, perceptual-motor, fundamental motor patterns.

7.0 A battery of assessment instruments are needed to assess the various levels of exceptionalities.

8.0 State Department of Education should require motor assessment in initial placement screening process.

9.0 Two levels of assessments: one at initial regional screening team level, the other on teacher level.

10.0 Retraining of individuals in psychomotor assessment.

11.0 Identification of schools that exemplify quality motor assessment screening procedures.

12.0 Conduct a motor assessment research conference to determine appropriate battery of instruments to be used. Establish guidelines and criteria for utilization of each instrument.

Group Recommendations

1.0 Physical Education is defined in PL 94-142; it is the only specific discipline mentioned.

2.0 Need to determine what we should be assessing and how.

3.0 There is a variability in what we are using to screen.

4.0 We now have teacher's screening that is being referred to screening teams. Teachers need training in assessment.

4.1 Need to identify a battery of assessments that are agreed upon.

4.2 Need psychomotor specialists on the screening teams.

4.3 Need for State Department of Education to require that screening take place at the psychomotor level.

5.0 Need State Department of Special Education to support a statewide needs assessment if they need help in psychomotor assessment and program implementation.

6.0 Need for some type of seminar or meeting of minds in physical education or motor development to develop these screening devices.

6.1 Need agreement within the field.

6.2 Need more research.

7.0 Meetings to train evaluators.

8.0 Inservice training to train teachers at the program level.

9.0 Pilot work in selective schools and show results.

STATE OF THE ARTS CONFERENCE
ON
ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
JANUARY 19 and 20, 1979

CONCLUSION

The State of the Arts Conference on Adapted Physical Education, conducted on January 19 and 20, 1979, was extremely important for the State of Mississippi. The Conference was the first attempt in the State to collectively identify, on a multi-dimensional level, those needs and issues which effect the handicapped and non-handicapped child in terms of special and physical education. Although attendance was not at the level anticipated, the Conference did succeed in having representation from a wide variety of professional backgrounds that included administrators; university faculty members; special, physical, and regular education teachers; State Department of Education officials; parents; and graduate and undergraduate students. The input that was provided at the Conference should establish a basis for continued dialogue, research, and cooperation. If the profession of Adapted Physical Education is to continue and progress in this State, then the leadership, direction, and enthusiasm that was revealed at the Conference must be continued.

From the numerous small group sessions that were held throughout the two-day Conference, several issues and recommendations were identified, presented, and debated. As the Conference Facilitator and an advocate for Adapted Physical Education and Handicapped Civil Rights, I would like to conclude Proceedings I by concisely and emphatically

stating several recommendations and needs that are essential considerations and requirements for establishing appropriate adapted physical education programs in the State of Mississippi.

Certification

The need is paramount that a review of current and projected certification requirements be initiated. The revision in current certification requirements is viewed as not only necessary, but essential for compliance with PL 94-142's position on the development of quality personnel. The current certification requirements require no course work that emphasizes physical education for the handicapped for either physical education majors or special education majors. Although projected certification requirements include a basic course in the adapted area, this still does not meet minimal requirements for conducting appropriate physical education programs. Quality practitioners are developed through quality personnel preparation programs. Since certification requirements dictate to a great extent, personnel preparation, then review of and amendments to current and projected certification requirements must be conducted.

Recommendations

-For the State Department of Education to reassess its current and proposed certification and recertification requirements in reference to the certification of teachers concerned with physical education for the handicapped. This reqssessment should solicit input from a multi-dimensional framework and not from a uni-dimensional approach.

-For the State Department of Education to require that certified elementary physical education specialists be employed to teach elementary physical education.

-For the State Department of Education to declare its position on adapted physical education in terms of interpretation, certification requirements, and other considerations that directly effect the employment and preparation of adapted physical education teachers.

-For the State Department of Education to require that administrators hire (as mandated by PL 94-142) adapted physical educators for the purpose of conducting appropriate physical education programs for the handicapped.

Personnel Preparation

The issue of personnel preparation is best viewed from a dichotomy which includes preservice and inservice programs. Since certification requirements dictate to a substantial degree the course offerings in a preparation program, certification and personnel preparation should be considered in unison. Competent adapted physical educators can only be parepared from participation in qualitative preservice and inservice training programs.

Preservice personnel preparation programs must consider the needs of the student and also the service which the student will deliver to the community. Undergraduate personnel preparation programs should stress the principles, methods, and materials needed to teach all children and provide practical field-based experience with various emphasis areas which include the exceptional child. Experiences should stress cross-categorical exposure to the exceptional child, consistent with geography and community or area needs.

Inservice training should promote the retraining of teachers who are in need of new or more specific skills. Because of PL 94-142 requirements, there will be a large number of teachers in need of new skills or

an update on skills learned previously. The system to meet these needs must be of a cooperative nature that includes the State Department of Education, institutions of higher education and the State Cooperative Manpower Committee.

Recommendations

-For school administrators to begin hiring adapted physical education specialists to conduct appropriate physical education programs. This is viewed as the cornerstone for developing and providing quality undergraduate and graduate personnel preparation programs.

-For HEW to realize the importance and necessity for a federally funded preservice (undergraduate and graduate) project in the adapted physical education area. This should be a cooperative venture among the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, State Department of Education, and institutions of higher education. This is a state as well as a federal consideration.

-For the State Department of Education to promote adapted physical education through an extensive public relations program that would include educational television, radio, newspaper, workshops, awareness sessions, etc., so as to inform the public on the need and importance of physical education for the handicapped.

-For the State Department of Education to develop a system for the identification of demonstration schools. These schools would demonstrate exemplary programs in physical education for the handicapped. Criteria would be used to identify these schools.

Curriculum

The issue of curriculum is not an easy task to discuss and moreover recommend appropriate action. Curriculum depends specifically on individual needs of the recepient and the professional competencies of the developer and implementor of the curriculum itself. For this reason, without first rectifying the many discrepancies and inconsistencies in the personnel preparation, certification, and assessment areas, discussions or recommendations for curriculum would be a bit premature. However, in line with the discussion conducted at the Conference, it would seem necessary to emphasize one major issue in particular. This issue concerns preschool programming.

The need for an overall preschool program is underscored by the effect that early intervention, that is, appropriate intervention has on the development of the preschool handicapped. A systematic means of preparing teachers would seem advantageous to the development of the preschool handicapped child. This system would, therefore, emphasize personnel preparation, certification, assessment, and curriculum.

Motor Assessment

The motor assessment area is viewed as the basis for all curriculum development. Currently, the handicapped children in the State are not being screened for psychomotor competencies to any measurable degree. Without proper assessment tools and techniques, appropriate physical education programs cannot be afforded.

Recommendations

-For a statewide need assessment to be conducted inorder to determine current methodology used in assessing motor functioning in

exceptional children.

-For a research oriented conference to determine the most appropriate tools for assessing exceptional children. The outcome of this conference would be a proposed battery of motor assessment tools.

The need in the State of Mississippi is for cooperation among the various agencies that provide a direct and indirect service to the handicapped and/or advocates for handicapped rights and education. Parents of the handicapped are becoming increasingly more aware of their rights and the rights of their children under PL 94-142. Although court proceedings would not facilitate the long term qualitative development of appropriate educational programs, they would, however, serve to initiate immediate service. Many times, programs that have ulterior motives for initiation, e.g., compliance to a federal mandate, are often lacking in depth and enthusiasm. No one wants the added expense and frustration associated with drawn-out court proceedings; but it will be inevitable if cooperation is not immediately initiated and continued. Handicapped children have the right to appropriate physical education programs conducted by qualified personnel. It is the responsibility of the various agencies involved in handicapped education to provide these services. If we fail in this golden opportunity, then we have not only done a disservice to the handicapped, but also to the admirable profession of Education itself.